



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,897	09/27/2000	Jun Ibuki	826.1628/JDH	4426

21171 7590 03/08/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

RIMELL, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2165

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/669,897	Applicant(s) IBUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Sam Rimell	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2175

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Paik et al. (U.S. Patent 6,148,312).

Claim 1: Reference is made to FIG. 4. Step (402) involves the extraction and examination of text (contents of articles) and text fact data (metadata). The metadata has at least three parts: (1) target object (article content in the metadata—col. 6, line 43): (2) an attribute name (the title of the article in the metadata—col. 6, line 42: and (3) an attribute value (versions of the article which are archived—col. 3, lines 15-16).

As seen in FIG. 4 step (404-406), articles which are missing metadata will have metadata created for that article. This is a grouping of data (metadata) with an article. Doing this step for all the articles is a step of data aggregation. The complete resulting set of information, including all metadata, corrected articles and non-corrected articles form an aggregated data set.

As seen in FIG. 4 step (408), the system detects an inconsistent data group (metadata that lacks an associated article of information) by scanning data set after aggregation (404-406) has occurred. The system then erases the erroneous metadata and determines the remaining data to be correct by proceeding to the “Return” step. The Delete Metadata” step aids in unifying the correct metadata with the correct article.

Art Unit: 2175

Claim 2: Step (402) is the data extraction unit. Metadata extracted includes target object (article content); attribute name (title of article) and attribute value (versions of article which have been archived). Step (406) is the data aggregating unit since it creates new metadata when it does exist and aggregates the data with each article. All the resulting data is the “one data set”. Step (408) is the inconsistency detecting unit which detects metadata that is not associated with an article. The correctness determining unit is the process step “Return” since only correct metadata associated with correct articles are determined to exist at this step. The data integrating unit is the “Delete Metadata” step since this step aids in integrating only the correct metadata with the correct articles by deleting metadata lacking any association with an article.

Claim 11: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 12: See remarks for claim 1. Note that the grouped fact data is completed at steps (404-406) so the inconsistency detection step (408) must occur on the grouped fact data.

Claims 3-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Remarks

Applicant's amendments have overcome the previous grounds of rejection under 35 USC 112.

The reference to Paik et al. remains applicable to claims 1, 2, 11 and 12. With respect to the Paik et al. reference, applicant argues that Paik et al. does not detect an inconsistent data group. Examiner does not agree. At step (402) in Paik et al., the system scans all the articles and

Art Unit: 2175

all the metadata. After first performing the data aggregation steps (404-406) it then performs inconsistency step of finding metadata that is not matched to any articles and deletes it. This is clearly an act of inconsistency detection since the inconsistency was identified and deleted.

Applicant also argues that in Paik et al., the inconsistency detection unit does not operate on aggregated data. However, this is in fact shown in Paik et al. As seen by the programming in FIG. 4, at steps (404-406), the system creates an aggregated data set, which is the complete set of data created by cycling through steps (404-406). Since step (408) does not occur until after the aggregation is complete the inconsistency detection must be acting upon the aggregated data set.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2175

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (571) 272-4084.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Rimell', is positioned above the printed name.

Sam Rimell
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2165